



University of Dundee

Multiple-therapy-resistant major depressive disorder

Mcallister-Williams, R. H.; Christmas, D. M. B.; Cleare, A. J.; Currie, A.; Gledhill, J.; Insole, L.

Published in:
British Journal of Psychiatry

DOI:
[10.1192/bjp.2017.33](https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2017.33)

Publication date:
2018

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Discovery Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Mcallister-Williams, R. H., Christmas, D. M. B., Cleare, A. J., Currie, A., Gledhill, J., Insole, L., ... Young, A. H. (2018). Multiple-therapy-resistant major depressive disorder: a clinically important concept. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 212(5), 274-278. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2017.33>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in Discovery Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from Discovery Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Author Accepted Manuscript Mcallister-Williams, RH, Christmas, DMB, Cleare, AJ, Currie, A, Gledhill, J, Insole, L, Malizia, AL, McGeever, M, Morriss, R, Robinson, LJ, Scott, M, Stokes, PRA, Talbot, PS & Young, AH 2018, 'Multiple-therapy-resistant major depressive disorder: a clinically important concept' British Journal of Psychiatry, vol. 212, no. 5, pp. 274-278. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2017.33>

Multiple-therapy-resistant-Major Depressive Disorder (MTR-MDD): a clinically important concept

McAllister-Williams RH^{1,2}, Christmas DMB³, Cleare AJ⁴, Currie A², Gledhill J⁵, Insole L⁶, Malizia AL⁷, McGeever M⁸, Morriss R⁹, Robinson LJ^{1,2}, Scott M¹⁰, Stokes PRA⁴, Talbot PS^{11,12}, Young AH⁴

Affiliations:

- 1 – Institute of Neuroscience, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
- 2 – Regional Affective Disorders Service, Northumberland Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
- 3 – Advanced Interventions Service, Ninewells Hospital & Medical School, Dundee, UK
- 4 – Centre for Affective Disorders, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK
- 5 - North Durham Clinical Commissioning Group, County Durham, UK
- 6 – North East Community Mental Health Team, Northumberland Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
- 7 – Neuropsychopharmacology and Neuromodulation, Rosa Burden Centre, Southmead Hospital, North Bristol NHS Trust, Bristol, UK
- 8 - Benfield Park Medical Group, Newcastle Gateshead Clinical Commissioning Group, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK.
- 9 - Centre for Mood Disorders, Institute of Mental Health, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK
- 10 – Newburn Surgery, Newcastle Gateshead Clinical Commissioning Group, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
- 11 - Wolfson Molecular Imaging Centre, University of Manchester;
- 12 - Specialist Service for Affective Disorders, Manchester Mental Health and Social Care Trust, Manchester, UK

Correspondence to:

Dr RH McAllister-Williams
Wolfson Research Centre
Campus for Ageing and Vitality
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE4 5LP
Tel: 0191 208 1366
Email: r.h.mcallister-williams@ncl.ac.uk

Running title: Multiple-therapy-resistant depression

Keywords: depressive disorders; inpatient treatment; clinical governance

Disclosures

McAllister-Williams RH: In the last 3 years RHMW has received support for research, expenses to attend conferences and fees for lecturing and consultancy work (including attending advisory boards) from various pharmaceutical companies including Astra Zeneca, Cyberonics, Eli Lilly, Janssen, Liva Nova, Lundbeck, MyTomorrows, Otsuka, Pfizer, Roche, Servier, SPIMACO and Sunovion. RHMW undertakes clinical work within a tertiary level specialist affective disorders service.

Christmas DMB: DMBC works as a psychiatrist within an NHS Scotland specialist service for OCD and affective disorders. In the last three years he has received no financial support or honoraria from industry in relation to research, travel, or speaking at conferences. He has received fees from LivaNova for attending an advisory board.

Cleare AJ: In the last 3 years AJC has received fees for lecturing from Astra Zeneca; fees for consulting from Livanova and Allergan; and research grant support from Lundbeck. In total less than 1% of his personal income has come from pharmaceutical company sources. AJC undertakes clinical work as a psychiatrist within a tertiary level specialist affective disorders service.

Currie A: In the last 3 years AC has received fees for lecturing from pharmaceutical companies namely Lundbeck and Sunovion. AC currently undertakes clinical work as a psychiatrist within a tertiary level specialist affective disorders service. He has previous extensive experience of working in secondary adult services.

Gledhill J: No conflict of interest. JG has not received any related honoraria or fees. JG is a General Practitioner with an interest in mental health.

Insole L: No conflicts of interest. LI works as a psychiatrist in a secondary level community adult mental health service.

Malizia AL: In the last 3 years ALM has received support for attending seminars and fees for consultancy work (including advisory board) from Medtronic Inc and Livanova. ALM undertakes clinical work as a psychiatrist with treatment refractory affective disorders (secondary and tertiary care) using psychopharmacological and neurosurgical treatments.

McGeever M: No disclosures to make. GP working in primary care.

Morriss R: RM is a consultant psychiatrist and the mood disorder lead for the National Institute of Health Research MindTech Health Technology Co-operative and employed in part through the Collaboration for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care East Midlands. He holds joint research grants with a number of digital companies that investigate devices for depression including Alpha-stim, Big White Wall, P1vital, Intel, Johnson and Johnson and Lundbeck through his mindTech and CLAHRC EM roles. RM works in both a tertiary level mood disorders service and secondary care general adult psychiatry service.

Robinson LJ: No conflicts of interest. LJR has not received any honoraria or fees in the last 3 years. LJR undertakes work as a clinical psychologist within a tertiary level specialist affective disorders service.

Scott M: MS is an associate at Blueriver Consulting providing intelligence to NHS organisations Pharmaceutical and Devices Companies. He has received honoraria for presentations and advisory boards with Lundbeck, Eli Lilly, URGO, AstraZeneca, Phillips and Sanofi and holds shares in Johnson and Johnson. He is a GP Principal and a GP Advisor to Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust.

Stokes PRA: In the last 3 years PRAS has received support for research, expenses to attend conferences and fees for lecturing and consultancy work (including attending an advisory board) from life sciences companies including Corcept Therapeutics, Indivior and Liva Nova. PRAS is a consultant psychiatrist within a tertiary level specialist and an enhanced secondary level affective disorders service and a specialist consultant advisor in mood disorders to the UK Civil Aviation Authority.

Talbot PS: In the last 3 years PST has received consultancy fees as an advisory board member from the following companies: Galen Limited, Sunovion Pharmaceuticals Europe Ltd, myTomorrows and Cyberonics Europe BVBA. PST undertakes clinical work as a psychiatrist within a tertiary level specialist affective disorders service.

Young AH: AHY has undertaken paid lectures and advisory boards for all major pharmaceutical companies with drugs used in affective and related disorders. He has received funding for investigator initiated studies from AstraZeneca, Eli Lilly, Lundbeck and Wyeth. AHY works as a consultant psychiatrist in a tertiary level affective disorders service.

Summary

Many novel therapeutic options for depression exist which are either not mentioned in clinical guidelines or recommended only for use in highly specialist services. The challenge faced by clinicians is when it might be appropriate to consider such 'non-standard' interventions. This analysis proposes a framework to aid this decision.

Introduction

There are numerous effective psychological therapies and drug treatments for the management of major depressive disorder (MDD) and guidelines for their use (e.g. those from the UK's National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)¹ or British Association for Psychopharmacology (BAP)²). However, a major challenge is improving the management of MDD patients who do not experience full or sustained remission of symptoms with standard, guideline recommended, treatments or who cannot tolerate them. A major issue is that many of the recommended treatments have similar mechanisms of action and in naturalistic studies there appears to be minimal difference in effectiveness between them.^{1,2} In addition, duration of depression is associated with worse outcomes,³ including social breakdown such as loss of job or relationship⁴ which in themselves can become barriers to recovery. Fortunately, many alternative treatments, with potentially different mechanisms of action, exist which are either currently not included in guidelines or are only recommended for use in specialist services – we refer to these as 'non-standard'. These interventions are characterised by having a more limited evidence base to support their use, being associated with greater risks or invasiveness, and/or being more costly than standard treatments. The important clinical question is when to consider them for a particular patient.

Problems and possible solutions

The answer to the question is in some ways simple. If the probability of responding to (or tolerating) a further standard treatment is very low then a case can be made for using a non-standard treatment. However, the evidence based from which to draw such conclusions is far from ideal. Studies vary in their definitions of degree of treatment resistance necessary for inclusion. For example, the data supporting the use of quetiapine augmentation of antidepressants was obtained in studies of patients who had had a sub-optimal response to their first, or possibly second, antidepressant.⁵ Inclusion in some studies is defined as much by chronicity as lack of treatment response.⁶ What studies there are tend to relate to patients who are treatment non-responsive rather than partially responsive, or to patients who have strong preferences for some treatments but not others.⁷ Overall, it is also important to note, there is little robust evidence from prospective sequential RCTs for the efficacy of options beyond third or fourth sequential treatments.⁸

One possible solution is to consider non-standard interventions only when all standard ones have been tried and failed. However, adequate trials of all possible combinations of pharmacotherapy alone would take literally decades. The evidence base does not support this strategy. Naturalistic data suggests that the response rate of patients with chronic TRD to standard interventions is only around 10% over one year.⁶ Further evidence suggests that the duration of untreated depression has a negative impact on eventual response.³ It is therefore clinically questionable to cycle endlessly through pharmacologically similar strategies.⁹

An alternative option is to use a 'threshold' approach. Conway and colleagues proposed 'treatment resistant depression' (TRD) be divided into "stage I" defined as failure of two interventions (medication or psychotherapy) and "stage II" defined as failure of three interventions.⁹ They propose that less invasive non-standard interventions could be considered for "stage I TRD" and more invasive

interventions (e.g. vagal nerve stimulation (VNS) or deep brain stimulation (DBS)) for “stage II TRD”.⁹ This threshold would allow for DBS for a patient after failure of 20 mg of fluoxetine and 20mg of citalopram, both prescribed over 6 weeks, and 8 sessions of cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT). We believe this is premature. This also illustrates the problem of a simple threshold approach with the challenge being how to find the best balance between timely access to alternative treatments versus unnecessary exposure to risky/expensive interventions. The threshold for different interventions is also likely to be different with, for example, the threshold for ablative neurosurgery being substantially higher than for a well-tolerated and safe non-standard medication. There are also a myriad of patient and illness factors that will also influence when a particular treatment might be deemed appropriate.

Rather than a simple threshold we suggest a more nuanced approach with a defined reference point, which we refer to as ‘multi-therapy resistant MDD’ (MTR-MDD), to help guide clinicians, patients and commissioners.

‘Multi-therapy resistant-MDD (MTR-MDD)’

The criteria proposed for MTR-MDD (outlined in Table 1), for the reasons outlined above, are based more on consensus than clear cut evidence. They have been developed by clinicians drawn from primary care, secondary care and specialist services (see the authors’ disclosure statements), including individuals with personal experience of MDD.

The intention is that the MTR-MDD criteria can be broken down into its various component parts to help guide discussions between clinicians, patients, and commissioners about when it may be reasonable to consider non-standard intervention. In totality the criteria provide something of a ‘back stop’ – if a patient meets all of the criteria but has not been considered for non-standard treatment, then the question “why not?” should be asked. We do not posit that MTR-MDD defines a specific subgroup of patients with MDD that may be characterised, for example, by a specific biology. However, the categorisation is potentially of use in research for stratification in trials of patients with particularly difficult to treat illness.

The term ‘multiple-therapy-resistant-MDD’ has been chosen to reflect that: several interventions (more than two) must have failed to produce or maintain a response, or have been intolerable; non-pharmacological interventions should also have been tried and been ineffective or intolerable; and that the criteria are specific to MDD.

Table 1: Proposed criteria for MTR-MDD

The Patient: Diagnosed with MDD (using the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual, 5 th edition (DSM-5))
Their depression: MDD of at least moderate severity.
Their treatment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psychotherapy. At least <i>two</i> trials of structured, evidence-supported psychological therapy.¹ The trials should ideally each be of a different modality and provided by a different therapist. In both cases, the clinician should assure themselves that the patient has received a structured course of therapy delivered by an experienced therapist with whom the patient had a good therapeutic relationship. Ideally, at least one of the trials should have been of at least 16 hours duration and at least one trial should have been given in combination with pharmacotherapy. • Antidepressants. <i>Four</i> adequate trials of antidepressants. There is little consensus with regards how antidepressants should be divided into different ‘classes’ and how important it is that drugs from different classes are trialed. However, it is recommended that the trials should not all be from the same class of drugs and that at least two trials are using antidepressants that are viewed as being potentially more efficacious in severe depression and/or compared to other antidepressants, for example as listed by BAP guidelines (clomipramine, venlafaxine (≥ 150 mg), escitalopram (20 mg), sertraline, amitriptyline or mirtazapine).² We would also recommend consideration of a traditional MAOI (e.g. phenelzine), especially for patients with atypical symptoms. • Pharmacological augmentation. At least <i>two</i> adequate trials of an evidence based augmentation/combination agent given in combination with an antidepressant. Ideally these should both be agents listed as first line options in BAP Guidelines (lithium (ideally with a plasma level of 0.6 – 1.0 mmol/l), quetiapine and aripiprazole).² • ECT. A trial of ECT (at least 8 treatments, and ideally bilateral if tolerated). <p>For all treatments: The requirement for a treatment may be waived if there is a recognised contraindication or the patient has, despite extensive discussions and the provision of information, declined it, or there have been well-documented adverse effects that have limited tolerability. This applies to ECT, psychotherapy and medication.</p> <p>Given evidence for possible greater efficacy of a structured psychological treatment in combination with medication^{10,11}, a period of combined treatment, possibly over a period of 9-15 months, is recommended.</p>

The full MTR-MDD criteria are met if there has been a **failure to respond, achieve remission, maintain a response/remission or tolerate** all the treatments listed in table 1. For many patients, it can be difficult distinguishing discrete episodes. It is inappropriate to re-trial medications that have failed in previous episodes unless the patient describes previous non-adherence and willingness to retry. As a result, these failures will usually be defined over the life-time of the patient.

As in any area of medicine, non-response to an intervention should lead to a re-appraisal of the diagnosis.¹² Alternative primary diagnoses such as bipolar disorder should be carefully excluded. Comorbidities that may be contributing to the resistant nature of the MDD, such as substance use disorders, personality disorders, anxiety disorder and attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), should be identified and treated vigorously. Similarly, psychosocial maintain factors should be addressed where possible. However, the presence of such comorbidity does not negate a patient meeting criteria and hence consideration being given to non-standard interventions.

For all medications, an adequate trial is one where the clinician is confident (based on clinical judgement and patient history) that the patient has been adherent to a maximum licensed, or maximum-tolerated, dose for an adequate period of time. In the case of a maximum tolerated dose, this must be a dose equivalent or higher than the generally regarded minimal therapeutic dose (e.g. as defined in the drug license). If a patient is not able to tolerate a minimum therapeutic dose, then the trial would be deemed to have failed on the basis of intolerance.

First and second line treatment trial durations are recommended to be 4-6 weeks, but for patients with resistant depression longer trials are recommended.^{1,2} We recommend that at least one, and ideally two trials of antidepressants have been used for a minimum duration of eight weeks at maximum or maximum tolerated doses based on the need to balance 'efficiency' of a trial (shortest reasonable time) with the need to confidently exclude a potential response. The duration of augmentation trials is rarely described in guidelines. RCT data suggests a relatively rapid response to some agents, for example antipsychotic augmentation (e.g. quetiapine⁵), while other strategies may take longer at least in part due to the time needed to reach a therapeutic level (e.g. lithium). Nevertheless, we would recommend a minimum of a four weeks, and ideally eight weeks, at a therapeutic dose, for augmentation trials.

With regards to non-tolerance, in almost all circumstances, clinicians should endeavour to establish that *all reasonable efforts* have been taken to ensure that the patient can tolerate at least the minimum therapeutic dose. This may require extended dose titration periods, using preparations that allow starting at very low doses, the use of other medications (such as benzodiazepines for example when using an activating drug such as aripiprazole) and frequent review. In many situations, the clinician should recommend at least one other drug from the same drug class to ensure that intolerance is class rather than drug-specific.

Determining the adequacy of a course of psychotherapy may be more difficult, as factors not always directly-related to the patient or their illness have been demonstrated to impact on outcome, including therapeutic alliance, therapist adherence to the therapeutic modality and match between patient and therapeutic modality.¹³⁻¹⁵ Some patients need several months of preparation by clinicians or psychotherapists to develop the psychological mindedness to benefit from a course of any psychotherapy. These considerations and assessment of past psychotherapy may of itself be a justification for seeking an expert psychotherapy opinion.

The rationale for including ECT as a requirement in the MTR-MDD criteria is that ECT is, for most people, a choice that offers a high chance of improvement¹⁶ and acceptable levels of risk compared with more advanced and/or less evidence based options. However, a failure of ECT to lead to a maintained response despite antidepressant prophylaxis, *or a refusal/inability to undergo a trial of ECT*, would be an appropriate prompt to consider alternative interventions with patients, especially if they meet MTR-MDD criteria.

Using the MTR-MDD Criteria to guide the use of non-standard treatments

Non-standard interventions can be considered to exist on a spectrum. At one end, there are those which have a relatively strong evidence base to support their use in MDD, are easy to implement, well tolerated, non-invasive and relatively cheap. At the other end, interventions have more limited evidence to support them, their use is more complex to undertake, they are associated with more risks or invasiveness, and/or they are of higher costs than standard interventions. The position of an intervention on the spectrum also depends on its regional and national availability and the expertise of the clinician(s) using it. Infrequently used interventions are more likely to be appropriate for

specialised centres. This, as well as other factors, is prone to change over time as more evidence is acquired.

Consideration of these issues can help decisions about the potential position in the treatment algorithm of specific non-standard interventions. Interventions supported by RCT data, well tolerated and of a similar cost to standard treatments are likely to be used early on. It may well be totally inappropriate to wait till a patient has a duration of illness of two years and/or has had three episodes of illness. When such interventions are used will be determined primarily by clinician expertise and local availability.

The threshold for some non-standard interventions may be determined by individual elements of the MTR-MDD criteria. For example, transdermal selegiline has been shown to be particularly effective in patients with atypical depression,¹⁷ but in many parts of the world is extremely expensive to acquire. As a result, it is probably reasonable that the MTR-MDD antidepressant criteria are met, including that a standard monoamine oxidase inhibitor (MAOI) that irreversibly blocks MAO-B is tried first. Similarly, the complex psychotherapy Cognitive Behavioural Analysis System of Psychotherapy (CBASP) which has data supporting its use in treatment resistant MDD¹⁸ but which is non-standard primarily because of limited availability, is likely to only be considered if a patient meets the MTR-MDD psychotherapy criteria.

Modafinil is not included in NICE depression guidelines,¹ though it is mentioned as an option for use in specialist centres in BAP guidelines² on the basis of four RCTs conducted in primarily non-treatment resistant MDD patients.¹⁹ In general it is well tolerated and can be combined with most antidepressants. It is therefore at the more benign end of the non-standard therapy spectra. It would seem reasonable to consider this if the MTR-MDD criteria for pharmacological augmentation are met. Conversely, pramipexole, which is supported by just two conflicting RCTs²⁰ and is more complex to use (due to the potential for impulse control disorders such as gambling)²¹ is likely to be considered only after a range of interventions have been unsuccessful i.e. beyond MTR-MDD augmentation criteria. Further along the spectra, Intravenous ketamine, which is supported by a number of studies but which is also associated with risk, invasiveness and limited duration of effect²² is likely to only be used if broader MTR-MDD criteria are met.

There are an increasing number of non-drug physical treatments for MDD that vary in their degree of invasiveness. Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) is well tolerated and supported by NICE recommendations.²³ Hence by our definitions it is a 'standard' intervention though its use is limited by availability. It may be considered before ECT in the treatment algorithm for some patients at less immediate risk. Conversely, VNS has been reviewed by NICE and recommended for use only "with special arrangements for clinical governance, consent and audit or research".²⁴ It might be appropriate to consider this if ECT has been considered inappropriate, unacceptable or it has led to an inadequate response. Given its cost and limited availability it is also likely that patients will meet the other criteria MTR-MDD criteria. The full MTR-MDD criteria are likely to be the bare minimum for consideration of anterior cingulotomy or other neurosurgical procedure, though the concern is that even for this highly invasive irreversible intervention there is often currently too long a delay before a patient is considered for this.

Clearly an additional factor that influences where an intervention is placed in the algorithm is the patient. For example, a concern about medication may lead to the use of a non-invasive relatively cheap non-drug physical intervention such as TMS early on. Alternatively the clinical characteristics of a patient may influence choice. With regards to standard interventions an example would be the use of ECT early on for patients with psychotic depression or marked psychomotor retardation.

Similarly, VNS might be considered for patients with highly recurrent depression despite ongoing prophylactic medication.²⁵

Discussion

With the welcome burgeoning of novel non-standard interventions, the question is where in the treatment algorithm they should be used. The appropriate place will vary between patients and interventions. Clinical decisions regarding this are a complex interplay between various factors such as: the patient's clinical state; research evidence; patient preference and expectations; and the expertise and experience of the clinician. A significant concern is that non-standard interventions are only brought into consideration much later than might be appropriate and that this is to the detriment of the patient, though they may also be used inappropriately early in some situations. We argue that the framework and MTR-MDD criteria described in this paper should complement clinical expertise rather than replace it, to act as a reference point around which to gauge when it is clinically appropriate to use non-standard interventions. We believe that a patient meeting all of the MTR-MDD criteria should be considered for non-standard treatment if this has not already happened. The criteria also act as a prompt for clinicians with regards standard interventions. Whether MTR-MDD criteria are appropriate for all age groups, including adolescents, is an open question. At the very least we hope that this analysis piece prompts debate around these issues.

Acknowledgements

This paper arose out of an advisory board meeting convened in November 2015 by LivaNova, the manufacturers of VNS Therapy™. Several of the named authors (RHMW, DC, AJC, ALM, PRAS, PT, AHY) attended this meeting and were paid an honorarium by LivaNova. The paper has been conceived, written and submitted for publication entirely independently of LivaNova and the authors have not been remunerated for writing it.

The authors would also like to thank two anonymous reviewers of previous versions of this paper. Their thoughtful comments provoked a significant re-conceptualisation of the MTR-MDD criteria.

References

1. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Depression: the treatment and management of depression in adults (update). 2009; **NICE Clinical Guideline 91**.
2. Cleare, A, Pariante, CM, Young, AH, Anderson, IM, Christmas, D, Cowen, PJ, Dickens, C, Ferrier, IN, Geddes, J, Gilbody, S, Haddad, PM, Katona, C, Lewis, G, Malizia, A, McAllister-Williams, RH, Ramchandani, P, Scott, J, Taylor, D, and Uher, R. Evidence-based guidelines for treating depressive disorders with antidepressants: A revision of the 2008 British Association for Psychopharmacology guidelines. *J Psychopharmacol* 2015; **29**: 459-525.
3. de Diego-Adelino, J, Portella, MJ, Puigdemont, D, Perez-Egea, R, Alvarez, E, and Perez, V. A short duration of untreated illness (DUI) improves response outcomes in first-depressive episodes. *J Affect Disord* 2010; **120**: 221-25.
4. Rhebergen, D, Beekman, AT, De, GR, Nolen, WA, Spijker, J, Hoogendijk, WJ, and Penninx, BW. Trajectories of recovery of social and physical functioning in major depression, dysthymic disorder and double depression: a 3-year follow-up. *J Affect Disord* 2010; **124**: 148-56.
5. Bauer, M, Pretorius, HW, Constant, EL, Earley, WR, Szamosi, J, and Brecher, M. Extended-release quetiapine as adjunct to an antidepressant in patients with major depressive disorder: results of a randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind study. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2009; **70**: 540-549.
6. Dunner, DL, Rush, AJ, Russell, JM, Burke, M, Woodard, S, Wingard, P, and Allen, J. Prospective, long-term, multicenter study of the naturalistic outcomes of patients with treatment-resistant depression. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2006; **67**: 688-95.
7. Dunlop, BW, Kelley, ME, Aponte-Rivera, V, Mletzko-Crowe, T, Kinkead, B, Ritchie, JC, Nemeroff, CB, Craighead, WE, and Mayberg, HS. Effects of Patient Preferences on Outcomes in the Predictors of Remission in Depression to Individual and Combined Treatments (PRedICT) Study. *Am J Psychiatry* 24-3-2017; appiajp201616050517.
8. Gaynes, BN, Warden, D, Trivedi, MH, Wisniewski, SR, Fava, M, and Rush, AJ. What did STAR*D teach us? Results from a large-scale, practical, clinical trial for patients with depression. *Psychiatr Serv* 2009; **60**: 1439-45.
9. Conway, CR, George, MS, and Sackeim, HA. Toward an Evidence-Based, Operational Definition of Treatment-Resistant Depression: When Enough Is Enough. *JAMA Psychiatry* 26-10-2016.
10. Cuijpers, P, Berking, M, Andersson, G, Quigley, L, Kleiboer, A, and Dobson, KS. A meta-analysis of cognitive-behavioural therapy for adult depression, alone and in comparison with other treatments. *Can J Psychiatry* 2013; **58**: 376-85.
11. Morriss, R, Garland, A, Nixon, N, Guo, B, James, M, Kaylor-Hughes, C, Moore, R, Ramana, R, Sampson, C, Sweeney, T, Dalgleish, T, and NIHR CLAHRC Specialists Mood Disorder Study Group. Efficacy and cost-effectiveness of a specialist depression service versus usual specialist mental health care to manage persistent depression: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Psychiatry* 2016; **published on line 03 August 2016** [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(16\)30143-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(16)30143-2).
12. Haddad, PM, Talbot, PS, Anderson, IM, and McAllister-Williams, RH. Managing inadequate antidepressant response in depressive illness. *Br Med Bull* 2015; **115**: 183-201.

13. Arnow, BA, Steidtmann, D, Blasey, C, Manber, R, Constantino, MJ, Klein, DN, Markowitz, JC, Rothbaum, BO, Thase, ME, Fisher, AJ, and Kocsis, JH. The relationship between the therapeutic alliance and treatment outcome in two distinct psychotherapies for chronic depression. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 2013; **81**: 627-38.
14. DeRubeis, RJ, Cohen, ZD, Forand, NR, Fournier, JC, Gelfand, LA, and Lorenzo-Luaces, L. The Personalized Advantage Index: translating research on prediction into individualized treatment recommendations. A demonstration. *PLoS One* 2014; **9**: e83875.
15. Weck, F, Grikscheit, F, Jakob, M, Hofling, V, and Stangier, U. Treatment failure in cognitive-behavioural therapy: therapeutic alliance as a precondition for an adherent and competent implementation of techniques. *Br J Clin Psychol* 2015; **54**: 91-108.
16. SEAN. Annual report 2015: A summary of ECT in Scotland for 2014. 2015. Scottish ECT Audit Network.
17. Pae, CU, Lim, HK, Han, C, Neena, A, Lee, C, and Patkar, AA. Selegiline transdermal system: current awareness and promise. *Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry* 15-8-2007; **31**: 1153-63.
18. Wiersma, JE, Van Schaik, DJ, Hoogendorn, AW, Dekker, JJ, Van, HL, Schoevers, RA, Blom, MB, Maas, K, Smit, JH, McCullough, JP, Jr., Beekman, AT, and van, OP. The effectiveness of the cognitive behavioral analysis system of psychotherapy for chronic depression: a randomized controlled trial. *Psychother Psychosom* 2014; **83**: 263-69.
19. Goss, AJ, Kaser, M, Costafreda, SG, Sahakian, BJ, and Fu, CH. Modafinil augmentation therapy in unipolar and bipolar depression: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2013; **74**: 1101-7.
20. Kleeblatt, J, Betzler, F, Kilarski, LL, Bschor, T, and Kohler, S. Efficacy of off-label augmentation in unipolar depression: A systematic review of the evidence. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 2017; **27**: 423-41.
21. Strejilevich, SA, Martino, DJ, Igoa, A, and Manes, F. Pathological gambling in a bipolar patient treated with pramipexole. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci* 2011; **23**: E2-E3.
22. Bobo, WV, Voort, JL, Croarkin, PE, Leung, JG, Tye, SJ, and Frye, MA. Ketamine for treatment-resistant unipolar and bipolar major depression: critical review and implications for clinical practice. *Depress Anxiety* 6-4-2016.
23. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation for depression. *NICE Interventional Procedure Guidance* 2015; **IPG542**.
24. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Vagus nerve stimulation for treatment resistant depression. *NICE Interventional Procedure Guidance* 2009; **IPG 330**.
25. Aaronson, ST, Sears, P, Ruvuna, F, Bunker, M, Conway, CR, Dougherty, DD, Reimherr, FW, Schwartz, TL, and Zajecka, JM. A 5-Year Observational Study of Patients With Treatment-Resistant Depression Treated With Vagus Nerve Stimulation or Treatment as Usual: Comparison of Response, Remission, and Suicidality. *Am J Psychiatry* 31-3-2017; appiajp201716010034.